SEPTEMBER 1955
VOL. IV No. 7

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy. Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

HUITIEME CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE BOTANIQUE
SECTION NOMENCLATURE

Président: J. Rousseau
Vice-présidents: Ch. Baehni, H. W. Rickett, W. Robyns
Rapporteur-général: J. Lanjouw
Vice-rapporteur: F. A. Stafleu
Correspondant-organisateur: M. Pichon

Suite des Discussions

Article 32

Mr Bullock presented the full text of his motion with regard to this article (The discussion on this article had been postponed). The motion read: "The name of the subgenus and section containing the type species of the genus must repeat the name of the immediate higher taxon unaltered and these names are to be regarded as validly published at the same time as the name of the genus itself, even if they are not at that time mentioned."

Dr Rousseau remarked that we had already rejected a proposal to mention author's names in such cases. Now we had to consider a new proposal regarding the dates of the new combinations.

Mr Ross said that the important part of Bullock's proposal was the part from "and these names .... time mentioned". This introduced a new principle which must be discussed.

Dr Amaral Franco fait remarquer qu'il semblerait plus raisonable que tous les taxa, compris entre le genre et l'espèce, devraient répéter le nom du genre, et non seulement le sous-genre et la section.

Dr Lanjouw did not think that Mr Bullock's proposal was necessary.

M. Baehni fait observer que la forme de l'article telle qu'elle est proposée par M. Bullock est contraire à ce qui se fait sous l'Art. 34 et les subdivisions d'espèces.

Mr Dandy supported Mr Bullock's proposal because he believed it would solve certain problems in the nomenclature of infra-generic taxa. He also believed that a corresponding emendation of Art. 34 would solve similar problems in infra-specific nomenclature.

Dr Rollins said that as the rules are now written, the same practical effect is produced as that sought in the proposal. He did not see any reason to change the present rule.

M. Léonard explique qu'il faut indiquer *Croton* subgen. *Croton* sans nom d'auteur. Il faut donc ajouter comme pour l'Art. 35: ". . . tel quel mais (en contradiction avec l'Art. 55) sans citer d'auteur."

The motion by Mr Bullock was then put to the vote by ballot and rejected by 146 votes against 114. La proposition est rejetée.

Recommendation 42A

Prop. A (298:18:4:—) *Accepted. Acceptée.*

Recommendation 58A

Prop. B (98:155:46:—) Rejected by show of cards (2 in favour). Rejetée.

Prop. C (32:257:18:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (132:128:40:—)

Dr Lanjouw said that the same proposal had been presented to the Stockholm Congress at which it was flatly defeated.

Dr Schulze war der Meinung, dass der alte Text (1935) in Hinblick auf die Form und Art des Zitierens (in, apud) besser ist als der gegenwärtige Art. 58A.

Dr Rousseau pointed out that it was only a recommendation. In some countries some recommendations might be disregarded.

A short discussion followed on the merits of this proposal in which Mr Ross, Dr Schulze, Dr Donk and Mr Dandy took part.

The proposal was put to the vote by show of cards, 27 cards being shown in favour, 25 against, the proposal was rejected under the 2/3 majority rule. La proposition est rejetée.

Intervention by Dr Ponce de León

Dr Ponce de León asked the president to read a protest, written in Spanish, in which he complained about the way in which some of the Cuban proposals had been dealt with. A certain number of these proposals had been automatically rejected whereas some proposals by the Rapporteur had been accepted that were mere modifications of these Cuban proposals. Common democratic procedure would have been first to accept the original proposal and then to consider the amendments. He asked the president to point out the precise nature of the procedure adopted in dealing with the Cuban proposals.

Dr Lanjouw stated that he had already acknowledged in his preface to the Recueil Synoptique that many of his proposals were indeed mere modifications of the Cuban ones. He once again referred to the influence and importance of the proposals made by Dr Ponce de León and his collaborators.

Dr Rothmaler gave a Spanish translation of Dr Lanjouw's answer.

Dr Baehni fait remarquer l'importance du travail de M. Ponce de León et ses collaborateurs et propose une motion exprimant la reconnaissance de la section.

Dr Rousseau put this motion of thanks to Dr Ponce de León to the vote and it was *carried* unanimously (applause). Le Président met la motion aux voix et l'on vote des remerciements unanimes au Dr Ponce de León pour le travail important qu'il a accompli.

Dr Ponce de León thanked the president, the rapporteur-général and the meeting for its kind consideration and appreciation of the work done by the Cuban botanists (applause).

The text submitted by Dr Ponce de León was the following:

Ilustre señor Presidente: Muy respectuosamente tengo el honor de dirigirme a Vd para suplicarle se aclare por esta asamblea, y así se consigne en acta, que numerosas de nuestras proposiciones, que merecieron la aceptación del Sr Rapporteur Dr Lanjouw, quien gentilmente así lo consigna, haciendoles solo ligeras enmiendas, dada la forma de la votación, aparecen rechazadas y aproladas unicamente las enmiendas, lo que es contrario a las normas parlamentarias. Lo correcto es aprobar la proposición original con la enmienda y así consignarlo, pues si la primera es rechazada la enmienda no puede hacerse. Es una súplica para que se haga la aclaración por la Asamblea respecto a todos los casos, como supo vuestra señoría hacerlo gentilmente cuando le llame la atención en un caso particular, lo que espero merecer de su excelencia y de los ilustres miembros de esta asamblea.

Nota. En este caso se encuentran también la formación del capítulo preliminar y la distribución general enmendada por la reunión de Ginebra.

New Article 70bis

Prop. A (20:265:15:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (246:58:23:—)

Dr Lanjouw explained that the proposal tried to prevent the bad practice of sinking varietal names by simply automatically changing the rank and so using the liberty of giving entirely new names to the same taxon. In such cases the type remains the same but the later author is at liberty to choose a new name.

Dr Rousseau did not want to have separate rules for subspecies.

Dr Proskauer quoted the difficulty concerning old "forma" names supplanting sound "varietal" epithets, the latter based (by reduction in rank) on older types.

Dr Rollins said that the aim of this proposition was to make it impossible under the rules to coin new names for what are essentially the same taxa by describing them anew in a slightly different category. For example, if a taxon has been recognized and described as a variety, this would prevent the description and naming anew of this same taxon as a subspecies.

Dr Rousseau agreed that this bad practice existed. He was, however, of the opinion

that it should be a recommendation only.

Dr Robyns propose d'ajouter deux ou trois exemples afin de clarifier le texte en question.

Dr McVaugh suggested saying merely "with or without the addition of another word".

Dr Wheeler asked whether this was intended to apply only when the available name is cited in synonymy? If it is to apply to taxonomic synonyms ascertained later it will have unexpected consequences.

Dr Fosberg was of opinion that Art. 70 as it stands has always been well understood and has caused no trouble. This proposal seems intended to prevent people acting in ill-will. Legislation with the specific purpose of thwarting action resulting from ill-will is bound to fail.

Mr Ross formally moved that proposal B be adopted but given the status and form of a recommendation and an example added to it.

Mr Dandy said that in view of the difficulties involved he seconded Mr Ross's amendment that the proposal should be accepted as a recommendation.

Dr St John suggested reading "infraspecific taxa" instead of subdivision of a species.

The proposal by Mr Ross was *adopted*, 31 cards being shown in favour of it, 15 against. La proposition est *acceptée* à titre de recommendation.

Article 79

Prop. A (166:109:18:1)

Dr Rousseau thought that it would be better not to speak of "symbol".

Dr Stafleu read the arguments put forward by Mrs Sprague in Taxon (2 : 114).

Mr Dandy considered that the argument for this proposal concerning the *Trifolium* species of Linnaeus was unsound and that the addition of the proposed words was unnecessary.

Dr Robyns proposed the following version: "When they exactly repeat the generic name with or without any addition".

The proposal was put to the vote and rejected, 12 cards being shown in favour, 35 against. La proposition est rejetée.

Prop. B (25:242:22:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (42:252:3:3) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. D (15:291:5:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. E (8:298:5:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. F (15:266:11:3) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. G (22:261:12:3) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. H (151:144:11:3) Withdrawn. Retirée.

Prop. I (no mail vote, Taxon 3 : 124) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 43

Prop. A (39:257:17:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (217:99:1:—) Rejected by show of cards (30 in favour, 29 against). Rejetée.

Article 44

Prop. A (8:325:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (7:310:1:10) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (72:221:13:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. D (28:100:161:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Prop. E (199:100:13:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (40 in favour, 10 against). *Adoptée*.

Prop. F (220:83:11:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (45 in favour, 7 against). *Adoptée*.

(A motion with regard to this article was put forward in the seventh session by the special committee for algae. This motion was *adopted*; it proposed that a new date in the future be fixed after which a Latin diagnosis would be required for algae).

New Article 44bis

Dealt with in the fifth session. See above.

Article 45

Prop. A (36:49:19:203) Referred to the special committee for algae (The committee reported on this proposal in the seventh session: it recommended its *adoption* and the section sanctioned this adoption).

Prop. B (36:52:19:200) This proposal had been referred to the special committees for cryptogams (The committees for fungi and algae took no action, the committee for Bryophytes recommended the rejection of this proposal in a report presented in the seventh session. The section accordingly rejected the proposal).

Article 48

Prop. A (19:240:27:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (13:249:28:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (61:207:16:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. D (29:242:25:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. E (205:76:26:—) Withdrawn. Retirée.

Mr Ross pointed out that if this proposal was adopted it would make it possible to validate a new monotypic genus based on an old species simply by referring to the specific description. This it not now possible.

Dr Lanjouw was of opinion that this could be remedied by adding "in the same rank"

to the first sentence of Art. 42. He was, however, prepared to withdraw the proposal, since the sentence might be useful.

Article 50

Prop. A (100:22:203:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. B (97:15:207:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. C (69:43:215:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 51

Prop. A (295:20:9:—)

Dr Baehni suggested the wording "names of taxa below ....".

The proposal was *adopted* as amended, three cards being shown against it. La proposition est *adoptée.*

Article 52

Prop. A (4:299:6:6) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (8:257:23:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (17:165:59:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (15:154:67:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. E (70:63:163:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. F (86:180:38:—) Rejected by show of cards. Rejetée.

Prop. G (79:33:164:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. H (38:75:178:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. I (193:89:34:—) *Adopted* by show of cards, 46 cards being shown in favour, 7 against. *Adoptée.*

Article 53

Prop. A (47:95:178:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 54

Prop. A (35:227:66:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 54bis

Prop. A (26:285:8:11) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 54A

Prop. A (26:236:27:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (205:96:21:—) *Adopted. Adoptée.*

Recommendation 54D

Prop. A (5:309:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (297:28:5:—) *Adopted* unanimously. Unanimement *adoptée.*

Recommendation 54E

Prop. A (31:286:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (7:308:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 54F

Prop. A (2:310:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 54I

Prop. A (14:24:281:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 55

Prop. A (49:14:254:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 57

Prop. A (33:253:12:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (45:63:195:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 58

Prop. A (6:287:6:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (246:56:18:—) *Adopted* by a considerable majority, 7 cards being shown against the proposal. *Adoptée.*

Recommendation 58A

Dealt with earlier in the same session (see above).

Article 59

Prop. A (no mail vote; Taxon 3:123).

Dr St John explained that this motion was made to provide a distinct means of indicating the first authority when it is based only on inference. It often has happened that the second author, say in the genus *Lespedeza* adopts a species previously known and described in the genus *Meibomia.* The second author gives no basionym, but he is dealing with the same species, of identical circumscription and identical epithet. It is inferred that the second author's publication is really a transfer. As he did not state the basionym it was proposed that such an inferred first authority be enclosed in braces.

Dr Lanjouw remarked that the typographical sign proposed by Dr St John would be difficult to use in some countries because it was not found in the normal typographic outfits.

Mr DANDY saw no need for a special notation in the cases mentioned by Dr St John. In the earlier works of Linnaeus's time it was quite common for a new combination to be published without direct reference to the basionym but with exact repetition of the definition of the basionym. In these cases there is no reason why the usual parentheses should not be used.

The proposal was rejected, one card only being shown in favour. La proposition est rejetée.

Article 60

Prop. A (241:40:29:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (35/10). *Adoptée.*

Recommendation 60D

Prop. A (4:304:7:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 60F

Prop. A (42:29:237:—)
Prop. B (13:73:220:—)
Prop. C (19:44:248:—)

Dr PAPENFUSS would like to suggest adoption of the word "sensu". Example: *Sarcophyllis californica* sensu Setchell et Gardner (non J. Agardh).

The proposals A, B and C were referred to the *Editorial Committee* together with the remark by Dr Papenfuss. Les prop. A, B et C et la remarque de M. Papenfuss sont référées au *comité de rédaction.*

Recommendation 60G

Prop. A (20:275:19:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (272:31:17:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée.*

Recommendation 60I

Prop. A (12:286:8:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

Section 8

Prop. A (213:45:52:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée.*

Article 61

Prop. A (3:301:9:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Recommendation 62A

Prop. A (165:109:53:—) Rejected by show of cards (25/25). Rejetée.

Article 63

Prop. A (3:313:7:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 63bis

Prop. A (4:330:—:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 64

Prop. A (278:23:24:—) *Adopted* by show of cards, there being one dissentient. *Adoptée.*

Article 65

Prop. A (35:78:199:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*
Prop. B (15:277:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (22:275:22:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. D (252:34:36:—) *Adopted. Adoptée.*

Article 66

Prop. A (52:23:235:—) *Adopted* and referred to the *Editorial Committee. Adoptée* et référée au *comité de rédaction.*
Prop. B (267:24:30:—) *Adopted. Adoptée.*

Article 67

Prop. A (5:310:2:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 68B

Prop. A (284:29:11:—) *Adopted. Adoptée.*

Article 69

Prop. A (223:25:37:29) *Adopted. Adoptée.*
Prop. B (24:203:38:29) Rejected. Rejetée.

The committee for fungi, in its report presented in the seventh session, proposed to refer the general wording of the article to the *Editorial Committee.* This was *carried.*

Article 70

Prop. A (11:304:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 70bis

Dealt with in the same session, see above.

Article 71

Prop. A (14:296:5:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 73

Prop. A (13:298:8:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (268:17:38:—) *Adopted. Adoptée.*
Prop. D (58:54:214:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*
Prop. E (31:268:9:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. F (8:299:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. G (= Prop. D to Art. 75; 26:128:162:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 74

Prop. A (34:90:191:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. B (3:312:8:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (177:125:15:—)

Dr Fosberg was of opinion that this paragraph was all right if "taxa" was changed to "plant groups".

Dr Rousseau thought that the third paragraph was a mere repetition of the first one.

The proposal was *adopted*, 41 cards were shown in favour, 14 against. Proposition *adoptée.*

Prop. D (83:221:19:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 74bis

Prop. A (54:228:28:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 75

Prop. A (38:267:13:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (37:267:13:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (12:283:19:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (26:128:162:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee* (This proposal was misplaced, it should be termed prop. G. to Art. 73). Cette proposition est référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. E (38:73:205:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

M. Baehni fait remarquer que le mot "taxon" est ici employé à tort: des éléments discordants ne forment pas un taxon.

Dr Rousseau referred this remark to the *Editorial Committee.* Remarque référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 76

Prop. A (39:236:26:5) Rejected. Rejetée.

Dr Baehni remarked that in this article too the word taxon should not be used.

Prop. B (15:90:18:193). Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (11:112:19:168). Rejected. Rejetée.

(The committee for fungi, in its report read at the seventh session, moved the rejection of these proposals B and C. The section *carried* this motion).

Prop. D (17:97:190:6) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. E (21:81:48:157) Rejected on the suggestion of the committee for fungi (see prop. B and C).

Prop. F (221:73:15:3) *Adopted* and referred to the *Editorial Committee* to find the final wording (the committee for fungi supported the adoption). Adoptée et référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 77

Prop. A (182:118:13:—)

Prop. B (182:118:13:—)

Dr Fosberg did not know what was a monstrosity. If an abnormal plant is described it may usually be referred to a species. If it cannot be identified the name applies only to the type specimen and makes no difference. This article is used in taxonomy classes to point out the lack of infallibility of those who make the rules.

Dr Rousseau suggested replacing the word monstrosity. Species might be monstrosities as was shown by modern genetics.

Mr Dandy was of opinion that Art. 77 presents difficulties because some names are based on monstrous forms of wild plants and should be rejected, whereas others (especially in horticulture) are based on *monstrous* forms because they are monstrosities. He suggested that the article be allowed to stand pro tem, but that it should be referred to the special committee which had been set up to consider the question of rejected names for the next Congress.

M. Pichon estime que si une espèce ou un genre nouveaux ont été décrits sur un échantillon anormal, mais sont malgré tout une espèce ou un genre vraiment nouveaux, le nom donné devrait être rejeté aux termes des règles, ce qui serait regrettable.

C'est le cas du genre *Podochrosia* (Apocynacées), décrit sur un spécimen à pédicelles renflés par l'action d'un parasite, d'où le préfixe *Pod—.*

Dr Papenfuss suggested that the special committee on stabilisation should be asked to consider the implications of this article and to produce a new article.

He also moved the deletion of the present article.

The prop. A and B were put to the vote and rejected, there being 24 cards shown in favour and 32 against. Les prop. A et B sont rejetées.

Prop. C (6:270:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (42:247:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

It was decided to refer Art. 77 for further study to the *special committee on stabilization,* but in the meantime the article would be retained in accordance with the above vote.

New Article 77bis

Prop. A (no mail vote; Taxon 3:124). Referred to the *special committee on stabilization. Référée* au *comité spécial.*

New Article 78bis

Prop A (198:110:21:—) Rejected bij 156 votes against 119. Rejetée.

(This proposal was dealt with in the fourth session, see above).

New Article 78bis-A

Prop. A (54:191:58:—)

M. PICHON fait observer que l'adoption combinée de la prop. E de l'Art. 32 et de la prop. B du présent article rend inutile la prop. A. Il regrette cependant qu'une confusion puisse naître dans les cas cités au paragraphe 3, le même nom ayant servi à désigner deux sections différentes.

Dr LANJOUW preferred prop. B to prop. A no. 1.

M. BAEHNI fait observer que 7% des espèces de la flore Suisse changeraient de subdivision. Il préféra le rejet de cette proposition.

M. PICHON retire les deux premières parties de la prop. A.

Parts 1 and 2 being withdrawn by the author a vote was taken on item 3. It was rejected by a considerable majority. La troisième partie de la prop. A est rejetée.

Prop. B (158:107:41:—) *Adopted* by 34 votes against 9. *Adoptée.*

Article 79

All proposals were dealt with earlier in the same session, see above.

Article 80

Prop. A (284:25:3:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée* à l'unanimité.

Prop. B (11:301:—:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (9:292:2:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 81

Prop. A (276:26:11:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée* à l'unanimité.

Prop. B (51:224:29:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (47:219:34:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (48:257:34:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. E (15:258:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. F (143:159:13:—)

The merits of the last sentence were discussed by McVaugh, Baehni and Lanjouw. As a result of this discussion Dr LANJOUW withdraw his proposal to delete the sentence but proposed that the sentence be treated as a note.

This motion by Dr Lanjouw was *carried* unanimously. M. Lanjouw retire sa proposition F mais propose que la phrase impliquée soit traitée comme une note. Cette dernière motion est *acceptée.*

Section 14

Prop. A (224:46:36:—) *Adopted. Adoptée.*

La séance se termine à 6h.30 — Session closed at 6.30 p.m.

Septième séance — Seventh session

July 1st, 9 a.m. — 13.30 p.m.

Dr ROUSSEAU suggested appointing a French mycologist on the special committee on stabilization and he asked Mme LE GAL whether she would be willing to accept such an appointment.

Mme LE GAL accepte de faire partie de cette commission spéciale.

The meeting unanimously applauded this appointment.

Dr LANJOUW then read the report of the committee for fungi.

Report of the committee for fungi

The committee for fungi of the Eighth International Botanical Congress met on the evening of June 29 and considered the items referred to it by the nomenclature section and reports as follows. It may be noted that all formal actions of the committee were approved by vote of two-thirds or more of the members present.

Article 6, prop. A. The committee proposes changes in the wording as presented by Boivin, so that the proposal will now read as follows: If, however, an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its name or names shall be automatically accepted as validly published under the botanical Code *as from the date of such transfer,* provided they were validly published under the zoological Code. However, the choice of the correct name shall be made in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature *and it must have been or be published in the form provided* by these rules. If an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature for purposes of homonymy.

Article 16, prop. C. The committee approves adding the words *"and for certain fungi"* and requests that the proposition be referred for final action to the Editorial Committee.

Article 21, prop. B. The committee does not favour this proposition and recommends its rejection. Fungi in certain groups must continue to be typified by figures and/or description.

Article 23, prop. B. The committee notes with complete agreement that this proposition, which would have been exceedingly dangerous for the nomenclature of the fungi has already been rejected.

Article 23, prop. D. 1st prop. The committee opposes this proposition and recommends its rejection.

2nd prop. The committee opposes this proposition and recommends its rejection.

Article 23, prop. E. This proposition is withdrawn by the proposers.

Article 33, prop. F. The committee recommends that this proposition be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Article 45, prop. A and B. The committee took no action on these propositions.

Article 69, prop. A and B. The committee recommends that prop. A and B be referred to the *Editorial Committee*, in order that any necessary changes in terminology may be made to bring the article in line with the remainder of the Code.

Article 76, prop. B, C, E. The committee does not feel that the status of lichen nomenclature as set forth in the present Code should be changed at this time, and recommends rejection of prop. B, C and E.

Article 76, prop. F. The committee recommends adoption of this proposition.

New Division III, prop. C. The committee approves this proposed new division in principle with the exception of paragraph 2 of *Provision 1.*

Podocystis. The committee agrees to relinquish the generic name *Podocystis* to the diatomologists.

Hantzschia. The committee agrees to relinquish the generic name *Hantzschia* to the diatomologists.

All other questions of proposed *Nomina generica conservanda* are referred to the new committee for fungi to be appointed at this Congress for further study.

The committee expresses its thanks to Dr Lanjouw and his associates and to Dr Rogers, secretary of the committee.

On Art. 6. Mr Ross was of the opinion that if we inserted "as from the date of such transfer" we should have great difficulties in knowing when the transfer is made. If we leave it out we have the difficulty of knowing how much of the animal kingdom has to be considered for purposes of botanical homonymy. This is probably the greater difficulty and he would personally support its inclusion.

The second insertion of the mycologists must read "effectively published" to meet the views of the special committee for algae.

Dr Martin said that the purpose of the amendments to Boivin's proposal for rewording of Art. 6 (Prop. A) was to avoid introducing homonyms dating from 1755 into groups whose nomenclature under the botanical Code begins at later dates.

In addition, it was intended to obviate the introduction into botanical nomenclature of recent names not published according to the botanical rules.

Dr Korf pointed out that the use of "effective" publication would eliminate the requirement for a Latin diagnosis, which is not what Dr Martin really desires. "Valid" is the word meant by the mycologists.

Dr Papenfuss remarked that the proposal as presented by the committee for fungi was in effect in opposition to Boivin's proposal. Adoption of the proposal of the mycologists would create great confusion as far as algal nomenclature was concerned.

Mr Margadant was of the opinion that the old reading was much better, it left no doubt that only publication of the name in accordance with the botanical Code had to be taken into consideration.

Dr Korf said that the proposal would provide a serious loophole in the requirement for a Latin diagnosis, since some mycologists at least consider all fungi to be animals. In publishing a fungus as an animal, no Latin diagnosis would need to be applied, and on transfer to the plant kingdom by the author or someone else the Latin diagnosis would now be circumvented. Also, the provision "as from the date of such transfer" as provided by the mycological group is important from the angle of homonymy, as without it we shall have to consider all possible animals which might have to be transferred to the plant kingdom in homonymy. Some such provision should be included in the present Art. 6.

Dr Fosberg thought that the only advantage in the proposed wordings over the present article was the provision that the status in botanical nomenclature dates from the date of transfer because any animal name is potentially transferable.

Therefore, if this provision were not adopted we could not know what names would be considered in botanical homonymy.

Dr Donk pointed out that there are scientists who divide living organisms into three kingdoms, of plants, of protista, and of animals and the Code applies to the plant kingdom only. So it is conceivable that both algae and fungi (nomenclatorally to be treated as plants) will first be described outside the plant kingdom.

Dr Rousseau thought that a note could

be provided to deal with this situation.

Dr MASON remarked that under the zoological Code, priority of publication is given to specific epithets; under the botanical Code, to the species name.

Dr FOSBERG said that we were also concerned with having as little disturbance as possible to the nomenclature of the rest of the plant kingdom. We did not want the introduction of such a name to knock out the name of a genus of *Rosaceae* with 600 species.

Dr ROUSSEAU thought that it should be possible for the algologists and mycologists to reach a gentlemen's agreement.

Dr ST JOHN proposed to insert "or any other kingdom".

The discussion continued for a little while but as it was clear that in this way no solution would be found Dr ROUSSEAU proposed to request the algologists and the mycologists to meet outside the conference room and discuss the problem together.

The remaining points of the report of the committee for fungi were discussed and *carried* unanimously. (References to these suggestions are inserted in this report under the appropriate headings).

Report of the committee for algae

The committee for algae has unanimously passed the following resolutions:

Art. 6. The committee recommends that the Section of Nomenclature accept Art. 6, prop. A, in order to continue the present co-operation between algologists and protozoologists in dealing with the nomenclature of organisms treated by both.

Art. 21. The committee recommends that the Section of Nomenclature reject Art. 21, prop. B, since it would be unworkable in view of the adoption of Art. 44bis, prop. C.

Art. 44. The committee wishes to draw the attention of the Section of Nomenclature to the resolution passed by a representative meeting of phycologists during the 7th International Botanical Congress and laid before the Section of Nomenclature at its ninth session (Rep. 7th Internat. Bot. Congr. p. 516). This resolution was to the effect that, in view of the large numbers of algal taxa whose names have been published since 1934 with diagnoses in a modern language, the action of the Section of Nomenclature in rejecting proposals to deal with this problem made it impossible for phycologists to obey the Rules strictly. The committee for algae emphatically endorses this resolution and calls upon the Section of Nomenclature to fix a date in the future for Art. 44 to begin to apply to the algae.

Art. 45. The committee recommends that the Section of Nomenclature accept Art. 45 prop. A and that the wording to be inserted in the Code be as follows:

"On and from 1 January 1955 the name of a new taxon of algae of specific or lower rank is not considered as validly published unless it is accompanied by one or more illustrations showing the distinctive morphological features, or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration".

New Div. III. The committee recommends that steps be taken to ensure that an appropriate proportion of institutional votes are so allocated that they are exercised by cryptogamists.

(Note: The part of the report dealing with *nomina conservanda* is published in Taxon 3(7) : 234. 1954).

Art. 6. It was decided to await the report of the joint algologists and mycologists.

Art. 21. The suggestion made by the committee was adopted by the section

Art. 44. Dr ROUSSEAU thought that this proposal by the algologists was perfectly acceptable and that it did not interfere with our present customs. We were in a regime of exceptions, so why not make another one.

Mr MARGADANT suggested that the mycologists should consider an exception for *Myxomyceta* too, then old Art. 6 could stand and the question of Latin diagnoses could be settled for the past.

After a short discussion in which Mr Ross and Dr RAMSBOTTOM took part Dr ROUSSEAU put this motion by the algologists to the vote. It was *accepted* by a show of cards, there being 4 dissentients. La proposition du comité d'algologie au sujet de l'Art. 44 est acceptée.

Dr PAPENFUSS speaking on behalf of the committee for algae, expressed its appreciation for the assistance given to the algologists by the Section of Nomenclature.

Art. 45, prop. A.

Dr DONK said that by admitting an obligate figure in addition to the description one opened the possibility for confusion; the figure(s) may be drawn up from a different specimen(s) than those on which the description is based.

The suggestion by the algological committee was agreed upon.

New Division III to be discussed later.

Nomina Generica Conservanda. These proposals will be published in Taxon and referred to the General Committee for final approval.

Report of the committee for Musci

Art. 21B. no objections.

Art. 45B. The majority of this committee opposes the proposal. There is no need to make a special rule with a new criterion for valid publication especially for the mosses as has been done for fossil plants in Art. 45. We might agree if it were made a rule for *all* plants. We agree also that it should be a recommendation, but this is already stated for all plants in Rec. F.

This report was *approved.* Le rapport est *approuvé.*

Report of the committee for Hepaticae

The committee for hepaticae approves the list of names of *Hepaticae* as printed in the Code except for *Androcryphia* which must be referred back to the committee for further study.

This report was *approved.* Le rapport est *approuvé.*

Report of the committee for Bacillariophyta

Mr Ross stated that the report had been published in Taxon vol. 1 p. 80.

This report was *approved.* Le rapport est *approuvé.*

Nomina generica conservanda

Dr Stafleu moved the adoption of the report by the General Committee and Advisory Board published in Taxon 3 : 155-156 together with the list of conserved names of fungi as printed in Taxon 2 : 30 (*Androcryphia* to be deleted, *Hantschia, Frustulia* and *Podocystis* to be added).

These lists were *adopted* unanimously. Les listes sont *adoptées* à l'unanimité.

Dr Donk remarked that in the list of *nomina conservanda* for fungi it would seem that perhaps quite a number of corrections of various kinds were necessary because the list had been drawn up with certain principles in mind that seemed to conflict with Rules and common sense. He had handed over to the Rapporteur General a memorandum containing some general and some special remarks, but he added that he had looked over only the names of *Hymenocetes* and a revision of the rest might become urgent too.

Report of the special committee to deal with Art. 39

Mr Dandy read the above-mentioned report (fifth session).

The committee consisted of Dr Amaral Franco, Mr Dandy and Dr Fosberg.

Dr St John had no objection to the wording of the present motion, but said that there would still remain a difficulty, or rather an impossibility, in applying the article, which requires that a publication be distributed, but states no minimum number of copies that must be sent out to effect distribution. Since no number is stated, there will be no uniformity in the application of the rule.

In 1944 when the allies attacked Paris, there was very little resistance but one shell hit and destroyed a printer's works. In this printer's were 498 copies of Viguier's Leguminosae de Madagascar. Previously only two copies had been distributed, one to the Paris Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, the other to the friend who had edited the manuscript of the deceased Viguier. Is the distribution of two copies of a book effective distribution? There is nothing in Art. 39 which allows a botanist to come to a certain conclusion on this issue.

M. Pichon indique à M. St John que toutes les espèces nouvelles du livre de Viguier dont il ne subsiste que deux exemplaires ont été publiées de nouveau dans les *Notulae Systematicae.* L'ouvrage de Viguier est donc considéré par les botanistes français comme n'ayant pas été publié.

Mr Margadant thought that the case of Dr St John was perhaps covered by the wording of the proposals: institutions in plural. So 1 copy in 1 institution would be insufficient but in 2 institutions it would constitute effective publication.

Dr De Wit pointed out that 2 copies of Teysmann's and Binnendijk Catalogue 1854 are distributed: 1 is available at Buitenzorg, 1 at Kew. If we accept 2 existing copies of a recent French book, we must accept the Buitenzorg book too, which means the probable change of more than 100 specific names. T. and B. were always rejected. We need a *number* of copies to be distributed.

Mr Dandy said that the special committee of course considered the question of stating in the article a minimum number of copies required for distribution, but decided that this was not desirable as its application would be impracticable.

The report of the committee was then *adopted* unanimously. Le rapport est *approuvé* à l'unanimité.

Report of the committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature

In response to a suggestion by the nomenclature section of the Eighth International Botanical Congress, a special meeting of the palaeobotanists to discuss problems of palaeobotanical nomenclature was held at 8.00 a.m., July 1, at 61, Rue de Buffon, Paris, with Dr Rudolf Florin presiding. Dr Ed. Boureau acted as secretary, and Dr S. H. Mamay assisted in recording the proceedings.

Prior to this meeting, Dr H. H. Thomas, retiring secretary of the committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature, had submitted by mail a list of agenda referred by the Seventh Congress to the Eighth. These were discussed at some length, together with various pertinent proposals contained in the Recueil Synoptique (Regnum Vegetabile, vol. 4). D. C. Bhardwaj, Ed. Boureau, I. C. Cookson, R. Florin, W. F. Harris, G. Kremp, T. Just, S. H. Mamay, and R. Potonié participated in the discussions.

The following actions were taken:

1. The original proposal regarding the starting date for palaeobotanical nomenclature as submitted to the Stockholm Congress by Dr J. M. Schopf (Art. 20, prop. 7: Synopsis of Proposals, Stockholm Congress, page 34) was recommended for adoption. The adoption of this proposal has the effect of nullifying prop. A, B and C, Art. 23 (Regnum Vegetabile, vol. 4, page 37.). The text of Schopf's original proposal is as follows:

> Replace the sentence beginning with "The nomenclature of Fossil Plants" by (j) *Fossil plants of all groups*, Dec. 31, 1820 *(Sternberg, Flora der Vorwelt*, Versuch, Fasc. I, pp. 1—24, pls. I—XIII).
>
> Note: Schlotheim, *Petrefactenkunde*, 1820, is regarded as published prior to legitimate nomenclature for fossil plants.

2. The *nomina generica conservanda* of fossil plants listed on page 548 of the Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress were recommended for inclusion in the list of such names formally adopted by the Eighth Congress.

3. It was recommended that the following items be referred to the new committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature for careful study and preparation of suitable proposals to be submitted to the Ninth Congress;

> a. Typification of fossil plants, including prop. B, Art. 21 (Florschütz, Regnum Vegetabile, vol 4, p. 37).
>
> b. Names of fossil plants derived from the organs of living plants.
>
> c. Names to be used when species belonging to different organ genera are united.
>
> d. Names of fossil dispersed spores and pollen grains, including proposal B, Appendix IV (Potonié: Regnum Vegetabile 4 : 115).

4. The following persons were nominated and elected to membership in the new committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature (Note: only the first ten names listed below were actually selected at this meeting. It was agreed that the palynologists should be invited to elect two representatives to the committee for palaeobotanical nomenclature, and at a subsequent meeting of the palynology section Drs Schopf and Potonié were elected to these two positions on the committee):

C. A. Arnold, U.S.A., Chairman; S. H. Mamay, U.S.A., Secretary; H. N. Andrews, U.S.A.; Ed. Boureau, France; T. M. Harris, England; Th. Just, U.S.A.; N. W. Radforth, Canada; F. W. Stockmans, Belgium; K. R. Surange, India; H. Weyland. Germany; R. Potonié, Germany; J. M. Schopf, U.S.A.

Immediately following adjournment of this meeting, a report of the above proceedings was orally presented to the nomenclature section by Dr Just, and the decisions contained therein were unanimously *accepted* by the members present. Le rapport est *adopté* à l'unanimité.

Report of the committee for lichens

(A report was presented by Dr Sten Ahlner. It was decided that the part dealing with *nomina conservanda* would be published in Taxon after which the names would be studied by the General Committee).

The commitee has voted on those proposals to the Paris Congress which were submitted to the committee. The results were:

Art. 21, prop. B. In favour 5; for postponement 1; abstention 1.

Art. 45, prop. A. In favour 6; abstention 1.

Art. 45, prop. B. In favour 6; abstention 1.

Art. 76, prop. B. In favour 0; against 7.

Art. 76, prop. C. In favour 0; against 6; for postponement 1.

Art. 76, prop. E. In favour 3; against 4.

Art. 77 Bis, prop. A (Taxon 3(4) : 124. 1954). In favour 2; against 5.

New Division III, prop. C. In favour 6; abstention 1.

This report was *approved.* Le rapport est *approuvé.*

New Division III

Prop. A (44:219:2:11) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (32:227:3:11) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (213:66:4:11)

There had been a general resolution in Stockholm that a chapter like this should be prepared. Dr Rousseau proposed to start with *Provision 1.*

Provision 1

Dr Mason asked what effect Provision 1 would have upon the reports of committees commissioned to report at the next congress? Would this make it impossible for their reports to become effective or to be acted upon?

Dr Keck said that the 10-year moratorium on modification of the Code can only be a recommendation or gentlemen's agreement rather than a law binding on succeeding Congresses. The plea was made that no changes be proposed that deal with language only (unless these be gathered together periodically and taken up only after 15 years or so), and that only proposals dealing with principles be submitted.

M. Baehni estime impossible d'interdire toute modification du Code pendant dix ans.

La solution est que les botanistes restent inertes et s'abstiennent de créer des commissions pendant 5 ans. Mais le prochain Congrès fera ce qu'il voudra: on ne peut l'engager.

Dr Lanjouw was in favour of having a 10 year's rest from nomenclature. However, he realized that it would be difficult tot establish a 10 years moratorium. What would be done with the results of the committee on stabilization for instance? We could not afford to wait another 10 years. Appendix III might also be modified by the Horticultural Congress and the moratorium would not allow us to insert their decisions. It would be better to reject the paragraph dealing with this moratorium. It would be a happy circumstance if only a few proposals were received for the Montreal Congress. Perhaps we could pass a resolution that for the Montreal Congress no proposals will be accepted on articles and recommendations dealt with in Paris.

Dr Rickett said that a further difficulty in declaring a moratorium would be that the proposals would accumulate for 10 or 15 years, and we should be worse off than at Stockholm. The suggestion made by the Rapporteur carries some danger. A somewhat arbitrary exclusion of certain proposals may cause ill will. A suggestion to the Rapporteur would be to edit the individual proposals, perhaps by correspondence with the editor of Taxon, before printing the Synopsis of Proposals, thus reducing the labyrinth of minor proposals in which we are lost.

Dr Lanjouw said with regard to Dr Rickett's last suggestion that in this way the work prior to the preparation of the Synopsis would be tremendously increased. One of the drawbacks of the present practice is that we always receive proposals after the closing date. Another circumstance is that we shall be busy with the preparation of the next edition of the Code until 1956.

Dr Fosberg said that acceptance of the 10 year moratorium assumed almost infallibility for the decisions of the session. The wording of the first paragraph makes us have a plenary session of an International Botanical Congress *under the auspices of the nomenclature section* etc. which is impossible.

Dr Rousseau ruled that the second paragraph was out of order. He asked for a confirmation of this ruling and it was *carried* by a large majority. M. Rousseau décide que le 2d paragraphe est hors d'ordre. Cette décision est *acceptée.*

Dr Proskauer moved that the Rapporteur be empowered to reject any motion made before the next Congress which corresponds in substance to one rejected either at the Stockholm or Paris Congresses.

Mr Ross said only the nomenclature section has the power to recommend modifications to the Congress. But the I.A.P.T. could stay in Prov. 2 because it provides the machinery.

A vote was taken on the first three lines of provision 1. They were *carried* unanimously.

A short discussion took place on the status of the I.A.P.T.

Dr Lanjouw agreed that it should not be mentioned in provision 1. It provided the machinery for the committees elected by the Congress.

Provision 2

Dr Rickett suggested "appointed" instead of "elected" (This was agreed).

Dr Baehni suggested including the president and the secretary of I.A.P.T. in the General Committee (this was agreed).

Dr Rousseau pointed out that these ex-officio members were extra and that 5 members were to be elected by the session.

Mr Ross asked whether the lichens were omitted in error or on purpose.

Dr Santesson declared that the lichenological committee agreed to be combined with the committee for fungi.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that a *committee for Virus* should be established.

Dr Ainsworth said that Viruses are covered by the new Bacteriological Code edited by the International Congress for Microbiology and it would be best for the Botanical Congress to accept the special virus committee of the International Microbiological Congress.

Dr Ramsbottom suggested that the committee be inserted between those of bacteria and cultivated plants.

Provision 2 was then *carried* unanimously on the understanding that in part 1, second line, the words "committee itself" were to be altered to "Nomenclature Section". La Provision 2 est *acceptée.*

Provision 3

Provision 3 *carried* unanimously. La provision 3 est *acceptée* à l'unanimité.

Provision 4

A. *Preliminary mail vote. a) Private persons.*

M. Baehni demande si l'on ne pourrait pas, aux termes de la "Provision 4", voter une fois par an sur les amendements mineurs qui seraient publiés regulièrement dans Taxon.

Dr Fosberg suggested removing categories 2, 3 and 4 from the classes of private persons to be given votes. The authors of proposals can certainly be expected to bear their share of the burden involved in handling their proposals by becoming member of the I.A.P.T.

Dr Rousseau pointed out that it was not possible to know beforehand the names of the members of the Congress. Point 2 should be deleted from provision 4A.

Dr Rothmaler war der Meinung dass "3. The authors of proposals" stehen bleiben muss, weil vielleicht einige Botaniker nicht Mitglieder der I.A.P.T. sein können.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that everyone could join the I.A.P.T. Financial difficulties could be overcome in all cases by special arrangements.

Dr Rousseau wanted to keep provisions 3 and 4 of 4A(a).

Provision 4A(a) was then *carried* unanimously on the understanding that point 2 was to be deleted. La provision 4A(a) est *acceptée,* le point no. 2 est préalablement rejeté.

Dr Lanjouw speaking on provision 4A(b) pointed out that it is always difficult to draw up a list. It would simplify the procedure if this could be omitted.

Dr Rousseau said that since it was only a preliminary vote item b might be rejected.

Item 4A(b) was then rejected, only 8 cards being shown in favour of it. La partie A(b) de la provision 4 est rejetée.

Provision 4B (Final vote).

Dr De Wit put the following motion before the house: "The right to the final vote in the nomenclature section should be restricted to those members or institutions who are admitted to the vote by force of a decision and invitation made by a special committee. The right to vote shall be granted to all those, who have proved themselves actively engaged in taxonomical research and who want that right".

He added that only the doctors could decide on the treatment of a patient, not the whole world.

Mr Gilmour suggested that a better analogy than Dr de Wit's "doctors", is that of the bakers of the world deciding among themselves what kind of bread the rest of the world should eat! This section was legislating for many thousands of name-users outside this room.

Mr Ross asked that the provisional list be submitted to the whole General Committee so that the secretaries of the special committees could consider it in the light of the taxonomic work done in their group.

Dr Lanjouw said that this was a difficult question. The criteria used in drawing up the list of institutions entitled to a vote were many: size, collections, staff, present and past activities, etc. The decision was of course always more or less arbitrary. An endeavour was made to provide a more or less even representation of the several countries, etc. It was very difficult to give definite rules and it would be a good idea to have a special committee to deal with this problem.

Dr Ramsbottom supported Mr Ross and commented on the general lack of proper representation of mycologists and other cryptogamists in institutional votes. He further pointed out the lack of balance in favour of

phanerogamists in general committees and instanced the Genève pre-conference.

Mr Gilmour asked for a committee to be set up to study the *criteria* on which a list should be drawn up.

Dr Lanjouw said that even committees did not know everything.

Dr Rousseau was of the opinion that in principle we should vote with personal votes only. A difficulty was however, that on certain Congresses there would be a distinct preponderance of local botanists. The number of European representatives in Montreal would be relatively low. In such cases it might be preferable to have institutional votes. He thought that a number of 7 votes for one institution was too high.

Mr Ross finally moved to submit the list to the General Committee and to include this provision in 4B (2).

M. Baehni fait observer qu'à plusieurs reprises un vote par cartes a fait suite à un vote à main levée sur la même proposition, et que le résultat obtenu a été le même: la suppression des votes d'institutions n'aurait donc pratiquement aucune conséquence.

Dr Lanjouw supported Dr Baehni's proposal. He had always felt that the botanists should be counted, not the institutes. He would prefer to have personal votes only.

Dr De Wit also pleaded for personal votes only but asked for them to be made transferable to a certain extent.

Dr Rollins thought that it would be dangerous to eliminate the votes of institutions. In most instances, the representative of an institute has consulted with his colleagues and really represents some solid botanical views that should not be cut out. Furthermore, it is unwise to put in the hands of the members who just happen to be in attendance at an International Congress the complete power to change the rules.

Provision 4B (1) was *carried* unanimously.

Provision 4B (2) was *carried* by 40 votes against 12 (show of cards).

The amendment proposed by Mr Ross was *carried* unanimously. It was decided to keep the maximum number of votes that can be attributed to one single institution at 7.

The motion by Dr Rollins to appoint a special committee to prepare a list as provided for in Div. III provision 4B (2) was *carried* unanimously.

(No members of the committee were appointed).

Article 6

Dr Stevenson read the following motion on Art. 6 presented by the algologists and mycologists:

If, however, an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its name or names shall be automatically accepted as validly published under the botanical Code provided they were validly published under the zoological Code. However, the choice of the correct name shall be made in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature and, except for organisms treated as algae, it must have been or be validly published in the form provided by these rules. If an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature for purposes of homonymy.

Note. In cases of homonymy botanical nomenclature will take precedence.

This motion was unanimously *accepted.*

Orthography

Dr Rousseau proposed that the report of the special committee on orthography (Drs Pichon, Rickett and Sprague) be accepted as a whole and that the Editorial Committee be changed to take action in accordance with this report. This ruling was *carried* unanimously (This report was submitted to all participants, it is reproduced as Appendix I to this report).

Remaining proposals

Dr Rousseau pointed out that several proposals had not been dealt with because of lack of time. They dealt for the greater part with minor points. He suggested that the Section refer them all to the Editorial Committee. This committee would have to treat them in accordance with the result of the preliminary vote.

This ruling was *carried* unanimously.

Faute de temps plusieurs propositions n'ont pas été étudiées. Le Président suggère qu'on les réfère au comité de rédaction qui alors tiendra compte du vote préliminaire. Cette règle de procédure est adoptée à l'unanimité.

Nomenclature committees

The meeting then appointed the members of the various nomenclature committees listed in Taxon 3 : 190-191, 214. 1954.

Languages

Dr Fuchs proposed the addition of a Spanish translation to the Code.

M. Troupin fait remarquer que le texte anglais est une traduction de l'ancien texte français, et que l'on a, à plusieurs reprises, beaucoup discuté parce que la traduction anglaise ne correspondait pas au texte français. M. Troupin propose de recourir au texte français en cas de contestation.

M. Baehni signale qu'en Suisse les trois langues officielles, français, allemand et italien, sont traitées sur un pied d'égalité et que les textes sont tous trois légaux.

Dr Lanjouw stated that at Stockholm it was decided that English should be the official language of the Code. In the third edition of the rules the English text has also been the primary one.

Dr Schulze sagte, dass hier allen Diskussionen und textlichen Abänderungsvorschlägen der englische und nicht der französische Text zu Grunde gelegt worden sei. Daher sei es wohl unumgänglich, auch diesmal den englischen Text bei der neuen Code-Ausgabe als den massgebenden den Übersetzungen zu Grunde zu legen.

Dr Rousseau said that English, French and German would be all official but in cases of difference of opinion we should choose the English one arbitrarily as the correct one. He asked for a vote on this ruling and it was *carried* by show of cards, there being 40 cards shown in favour and 9 against.

M. Rousseau déclare que les textes anglais, français et allemands devraient tous être officiels mais qu'en cas de divergences d'opinion entre les versions, il pourrait être entendu qu'on choisirait arbitrairement le texte anglais comme le texte correct. Ce point de vue est soumis au vote et *accepté* par 40 voix contre 9.

Dr Rousseau asked whether anyone wanted to present any other motion in the interest of plant nomenclature.

Dr Ramsbottom asked to speak on behalf of the section in order to thank Dr Rousseau for the excellent way in which he had presided over the meetings and for the fine manner in which he had kept everyone reasonable. Dr Rousseau's charm and humour had led to a very agreeable and succesful treatment of the problems before us.

Dr Rousseau thanked Dr Ramsbottom for his kind words and he thanked everyone for their cooperation. We had discussed many problems and they had received treatment in accordance with their intrinsic value. As a president he might have slipped, but he had tried to do his best.

He wanted to express his sincere thanks to Miss Keuken for the excellent way in which she had taken her stenographic notes.

Dr Robyns wanted to thank the Rapporteur for the excellent work he had done in order to enable the section to accomplish its task.

Mr Ross thanked the other members of the "Bureau" for the assistance given to the work of the section.

Dr Rousseau then declared the proceedings closed. Le Président déclare closes les délibérations de la Section de Nomenclature.

La séance se termine à 1 h. 30. — Session closed at 1.30 p.m.

APPENDICE I

RAPPORT DU COMITÉ SPÉCIAL POUR LES QUESTIONS D'ORTHOGRAPHE
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ORTHOGRAPHY

The following report embodies the views of a special committee formed at the invitation of Dr J. Lanjouw to report to the congress on certain proposals dealing with orthography of names. The committee consisted of M. Pichon, H. W. Rickett and T. A. Sprague. The report is drawn up by H. W. Rickett after correspondence with the other members.

Numbers in parenthesis refer to pages of the *Recueil Synoptique*.

Article 82

A. (98). Brenan's proposal raises Rec. 82B(c) and 82C(c), in effect, to the status of an article by adding their substance as a note to Art. 82. This would enable us to eliminate accents, umlauts, etc. from older names in which they may be found and would prohibit their use in future. Furthermore these provisions for transcribing signs and letters not found in classical Latin would then concern *all* names, not only those derived from personal names.

The Committee endorses the proposal, with some changes in wording. Several persons have called attention to the fact that to "suppress" a diacritic sign may lead to the transformation of (e.g.) "mülleri" to "mulleri", which would be an incorrect orthography. The following wording is suggested by Rickett and supported by Sprague:

"The consonants *w* and *y*, foreign to clas-

sical Latin, and *K*, rare in that language, are permissible in botanical Latin.

"Diacritic signs are not used in botanical Latin. In names (either new or old) drawn from words in which such signs appear, the signs must be suppressed with the necessary transcription of the letters so modified; for example, *ä, ö, ü* become respectively *ae, oe, ue*; *é, è, ê* become *e*, or sometimes *ae*; *ø* becomes *oe*. The diaeresis, however, is permissible (*Cephaëlis* not *Cephaelis*)."

Pichon proposes the following more detailed wording:

"Les consonnes *w* et *y*, étrangères au latin classique, et la consonne *k*, rare en latin, sont admises dans le latin des botanistes. Le tréma est employé (et doit, au besoin, être ajouté) pour indiquer que deux voyelles, habituellement liées en latin, doivent être prononcées séparément (ex.: *Cephaëlis*, non pas *Cephaelis*). Le tréma placé sur les lettres *a, o* et *u* doit être transcrit par un *e* faisant suite à la lettre (*ä, ö, ü* deviennent *ae, oe, ue*). De même *ø* devient *oe*. Tous les autres signes diacritiques, et le tréma dans tous les autres cas, doivent être supprimés."

He also proposes to replaces Rec. 82B(c) and 82C(c) by the following:

"Les autres syllabes du nom conserveront leur orthographe exacte, ou modifiée seulement dans les cas prévus dans la note 5 de l'art. 82. Toutefois, on pourra transcrire les *è* et les *ê* de la langue française par *ae*, pour leur conserver l'accentuation originale."

It is suggested that the exact wording may be left to the Editorial Committee, if the proposed change is accepted in principle. It may be pointed out that the more sweeping disposal of diacritic signs in Pichon's version ("all others to be suppressed") may perhaps lead to trouble. No mention is made of such letters as å, č, ć.

Article 7

Part of Brenan's proposal, omitted from the *Recueil Synoptique*, is to add the following to Article 7:

"In names taken from languages other than Latin the consonants *k*, *w* and *y* may be used in addition to the letters found in classical Latin. No other letters, nor any diacritic signs, are permitted in botanical Latin, but the diaeresis sign may be used where required, e.g. *Cephaëlis*, not *Cephaelis*."

In the opinion of the Committee, Art. 7, which is a "guiding principle", should not be encumbered by such detail; the provisions, in themselves desirable, are incorporated into the proposed new note to Art. 82 (above).

Sprague further proposes that the last sentence of Art. 7 should be deleted as, being a recommendation, it is out of place in the first chapter. He suggests that its substance be incorporated in a new recommendation as follows:

"Rec. 30A(i). To use Latin terminations as far as possible."

Article 82

B(98). St. John proposes to delete Note 2 (with the associated examples), on the grounds that Rec. 82H, on which it is based, being a recommendation, does not permit the changing of an existing name; a recommendation is not retroactive. With this argument two members of the Committee are in accord. Sprague, however, writes: "it has been the general practice to alter epithets like *salviaefolius* and *viciaefolius* to *salviifolius* and *viciifolius* and this practice was authorized at Cambridge in 1930"; and, further, "if you insist on the retention of the original spelling, there will always be botanists who decline to obey the rule. So the best thing, in my opinion, is to leave the recommendations concerned as they stand, but to allow sticklers for compliance with them to treat any contravention of them as an orthographic error which may be corrected."

A similar problem arises with Rec. 82C(b) and (c). The Stockholm congress accepted a Note 2 bis in Art. 82 to permit the correction, as orthographic errors, of terminations at variance with these recommendations. For the same reason, i.e. that a recommendation cannot "prescribe" the form of future names or permit changes in existing names, the Editorial Committee placed the substance of this note in the recommendation (last sentence of (b)) instead of in the article. Sprague proposes the restoration of the note as follows:

"Art. 82. Note 2bis. The use of the terminations *i, ae* or *anus* instead of *ii, iae* or *ianus* prescribed in Rec. 82C(a), (b) and (d) and Rec. 82D, and the reverse errors, are treated as unintentional orthographic errors."

It cannot be denied that Sprague's contentions have weight. R. Ross has urged the same considerations in a letter. Two difficulties must be considered if any such modification of the existing rule is made: 1) permission to change the original spelling (as in *salviaefolius* to *salviifolius*, *Dioscorea lecardi* to *Dioscorea lecardii*) must form

part of the article and be stated as an exception to the rule; 2) such permission will also open the way to such changes as that from *atropurpureus* to *atripurpureus* and *Myosurus* to *Myourus*, if any one wants to make them. It should also be pointed out (especially to the Editorial Committee) that the "ae" and "i" of *salviaefolius* and *salviifolius* are not, strictly speaking, "connecting vowels". Rickett suggests that the only way to make such changes permissible is to include in Art. 82 a note to provide specifically for such changes, as exceptions to the rule.

Two of the three members of the Committee endorse St. Johns proposal.

C(98). St. John proposes to add to Note 3: "An author has the right to correct typographic or orthographic errors in his own earlier publications . . ."

Since any botanist has the right to correct the errors of any author, including his own, the Committee is unanimous in rejecting this proposal.

D. This proposal is a consequence of B above.

E(98). Janchen proposes to delete *Mesembryanthemum* and *Amaranthus* as examples of spellings to be retained; he regards them as orthographic errors. The Committee is unanimous in rejecting this proposal, and in supporting the conclusions of Sprague in Kew Bull. 1928 : 113, 287.

(It is suggested that it would be well to include in the Code references to the literature in which the status of such troublesome orthographics is discussed.)

(The English text of the Code contains a serious error; the two spellings *Amaranthus* and *Amarantus* are transposed; the French text is correct.)

Janchen's remarks on *Desmostachys* and *Desmostachya, macrostachys* and *macrostachya* reveal a point which he and perhaps others may not have clearly grasped. He objects to listing the generic names as "different names" while the specific epithets are given as examples of "orthographic variants". But generic names and epithets are capable of quite different treatment. *Epithets* can only be confused *if they apply to species of the same genus*; there is no reason whatever to class them as "different names" if they are taxonomically separated. *Generic names stand alone*; they encounter the homonym rule if they are orthographic variants of the same name; only the earliest may be retained. In order to avoid such a loss of names the Code provides that they may be "treated as different names" when they are sufficiently distantly related that there is little or no risk of confusion.

The question of "hemsleyi" vs. "hemsleyanus" is taken up under Rec. 82I.

F(99). Pinto da Silva proposes to delete the words "and the plants so closely related" from Art. 82. In the opinion of two members of the Committee, to do so would completely change the article and necessitate rejection of *Rubia* or *Rubus*, Monochaete or Monochaetum, *Peponia* or *Peponium* (whichever was later in each case); since these names, belonging to taxa in widely separated groups, are not likely to be confused, such action is unnecessary; on the other hand *Astrostemma* and *Asterostemma*, both in Asclepiadaceae, obviously invite confusion. Pinto da Silva points out, correctly, that the principle of relationship is not used for the four names derived from Bradley; but the *other* examples show clearly that the principle is in fact utilized in determining which names are "different names" and which are "orthographic variants". In recognition of the objection, the following rewording of the second sentence of the article is proposed:

"When two or more generic names are similar and are likely to be confused because they are applied to related taxa or for any other reason, they are to be treated as variants of the same name."

The third member of the Committee objects that the taxonomic position of genera should not influence nomenclature, being subject to variation with different authors. In Rickett's opinion, the examples mentioned above sufficiently dispose of this argument; it is extremely unlikely that any author will place *Monochaete* and *Monochaetum* in the same family, or *Astrostemma* and *Asterostemma* in different families.

G (99). Conners proposes to treat the nominative case, in names of parasites involving the name of a host, as an orthographic error, to be changed to the genitive. He gives as an example *Puccinia coronata* f. sp. *agrostis*, which he would correct to *P. coronata* f. sp. *agrostidis*. Most unfortunately for his argument, "agrostidis" is *not* the genitive of Agrostis; "agrostis" is; the name as originally written is grammatically and orthographically sound. The name that needs correction among these examples (if any may be corrected on such grounds) is *Puccinia coronata calamagrostidis*. The Committee rejects the proposal.

(Pichon suggests that the case is already

covered by the third paragraph of Art. 33 and the second sentence of the second paragraph of Art. 34.)

Recommendation 82A

A, B (99). Buchanan and Paclt present detailed tables for transliteration of alphabets other than Roman. Both, in the opinion of the Committee, need further study by qualified linguists as well as by botanists. The international system which serves as a basis for transliteration of the cyrillic alphabets may not be the best for botanists. For example, the use of *je, ju, ja* for what would be spelled in English *ye, yu, ya* (or *ie, iu, ia*) would confuse those who speak English. *Ch* for the guttural would be difficult for those who speak English, Spanish or French. The reintroduction of diacritic signs (č, š) would necessitate revision of Art. 82 and of our manner of writing botanical names. Buchanan's table for transliteration of Greek, though useful to some persons, raises difficulties.

To substitute the Latin ending *-um* for the Greek *-on* is not merely transliteration, it is translation, and was not always practised in classical times (Buchanan and Paclt have different concepts of what transliteration is). Several statements need modification, as that the ending *-os* is a "masculine nominative ending"; so it is, but it is also a common ending of the genitive.

The Committee is of the opinion that the incorporation of such tables in the Code at this time would be premature at best and perhaps more confusing than useful; also, as Mr. Ross writes, any such tables would be incomplete if they did not cover also Arabic, Hindustani, Japanese, Chinese, etc. The botanist confronted by such problems should consult a student of language.

Aside from the table, the introductory statement made by Buchanan as a substitute for Rec. 82A is worthy of consideration:

"When a new name or epithet of a taxon is to be derived from Greek, the transliteration to Latin form should conform to classical usage." (The wording is slightly modified.)

C (100). Janchen proposes to insert an initial *h* wherever the spiritus asper appeared in the original Greek word, by raising the recommendation to the status of an article. Since one cannot make the existing literature uniform by such a rule, and since botanists would find it confusing to write, for example, *Helodea* while using manuals (e.g. in teaching) in which the name appears as *Elodea,* such a rule would not be conducive to nomenclatural stability. The proposal was rejected by the Committee.

Recommendation 82B

A (100). La Société Mycologique de France proposes an addition which the Committee rejects as already provided for in Art. 7 ("to avoid giving to names of genera and species a form which is too gravely at variance with the orthography and phonetics of Latin."). The same applies to the proposal to "suppress" "les éléments morphologiques inconnus du latin". Are any specific epithets published as "de l'Éclusei"?

They add a proposal that the derivation of names should be given when not obvious, which the Committee endorses and proposes as a new Recommendation:

"Rec. 30A (j). To give the derivation or origin of new generic names".

B. See under Art. 82 above on the "suppression" of diacritic signs.

C (100). Pinto da Silva wishes to recommend that a generic name formed from a personal name ending in *ea, ia, oa* or *ua* be identical with it; e.g. *Garcia* instead of *Garciaea.* The example "Correaea" seems not so formidable to the Committee as it does to Pinto da Silva; we already have *Andreaea.* It is true that names of tribes formed from such names are difficult, as "Garciaeeae." But they are likely to be few. (cf. Andreaeaceae.) The Committee is opposed to cumbering the code with such a recommendation.

In any case the word "must" is out of place in a recommendation.

Recommendation 82C

A (101). Sprague's suggestion to change "subspecific" to "infraspecific" is endorsed by the Committee.

B (101). In the Prop. A of the Société Mycologique de France under Rec. 82B, part relates to this recommendation: that every "terme spécifique" having a termination identical with a Latin ending be declined as a Latin word. This would apparently suggest such forms as "Hi" as the genitive of Hus, "Bli" from Blum, "Jonis" or perhaps "Jonei" from Jones, "Andri" from Andrus, "Friis" or "Friei" from Fries. It was rejected by the Committee.

C (101). See Prop. B under Rec. 82B.

D (101). See under Art. 82.

E (101). Herter recommends adding a list of examples of Greek and Latin genitives; there seems no need for such an addition.

Recommendation 82E

A (102). Pinto da Silva proposes to add *-inus* to the suggested endings. The Committee endorses the proposal, with the addition of the example *argentinus*.

B (103). Ponce de León and Alvarez propose to substitute for this recommendation a more elaborate one in which they suggest different endings for names drawn from independent nations, from countries subordinate to another or provinces, and from geographical regions. The proposal seems impractical. It is often difficult to ascertain which countries are "independent", and such status may change from time to time; existing names would further nullify such provisions (cf. virginiana, virginiensis, virginica, all used interchangeably as far as meaning is concerned). The Committee rejects the proposal.

Recommendation 82F

A (102). Baehni proposes the verbal change of "specific (or other) epithets" to simply "epithets".

B (102). Sprague corrects this to "specific and infraspecific epithets", since subgeneric epithets are not here meant.

The Committee endorses Sprague's wording.

C (102). Janchen proposes to make classical spelling obligatory both for new and old names, changing *sylvatica* to *silvatica*, etc. This would mean a revision of Art. 82.

D (103). Pinto da Silva proposes exactly the reverse, but only as part of the recommendation.

In the opinion of the Committee both these proposals should be rejected. To make such rules or recommendations is to open the door to an effort towards standardized spelling, and botanists would become involved in an endless controversy over such names as pensylvanicus vs. pennsylvanicus, kashmiriana vs. cachemyriana, himalaicus vs. himalayicus, nepaulensis, napaulensis, nepalensis and nipalensis, allegheniensis and alleganiensis, and many others. We should also have to worry about standardizing transliteration from Greek (Callicarpa but Kallophyllon). In short, we should have to abandon the present Art. 82. It is our opinion that Art. 82 contains a workable principle, retention of the original spelling, even if the results seem at times "illogical". It is less trouble to refer to the place of original publication than to become involved in philologic or linguistic disputes.

Recommendation 82G

This, since it is typography rather than orthography, was not assigned to the Committee. For that very reason the Committee suggests that it either be deleted altogether or removed to a new section on "Typography".

One member supports Prop. G.

Recommendation 82H

A, B (105). St. John's verbal changes were not considered by the Committee. They seem acceptable to Rickett.

Recommendation 82I

A (105). Janchen's proposal to disallow such epithets as *hemsleyi* and *hemsleyanus* in the same genus is rejected by the Committee, who feel that there are few such examples and that they are not likely to cause confusion.

Two members of the Committee suggest the deletion of this recommendation. Being only a recommendation, it cannot provide a basis for changes in existing names; and it is of no use as a guide to the making of new names.

Recommendation 83A

A, B(106). St. John proposes either to restore this to the status of an article, or to make extensive changes in its wording. Sprague writes: "It represents a compromise between two opposing points of view and was purposely changed from an Article to a Recommendation at Amsterdam." In this he is supported by Rickett.

None of us can see that there is any necessity for any changes in the wording of the recommendation as suggested by St. John, if it remains a recommendation. The Committee, then, rejects both proposals.

C, D, E (106). The Committee endorses these proposals.

F. Ponce de León and Alvarez (107) propose to make the recommendation an article; which is opposed by a majority of the Committee.

Article 28

A (45) was shown by Rickett to introduce confusion into nomenclature; an alternative proposal (6; 46) was made by Rickett and one to much the same effect by Pichon (B; 45); subsequently Ponce de León and Alvarez have advanced a new proposal (D; 46), substantially the same as B and C, with a long explanatory note and examples.

The object of all these proposals is the

same: to render more precise the words dealing with the formation of family names. The present article says only that the name of a family is "taken from that of its type genus". This vague statement leads to such alternatives as Melastomaceae and Melastomataceae, Haloragaceae and Haloragidaceae. It is the object of all the proposals to legalize the latter of each of these pairs. In English this is expressed by Prop. C, to add the suffix -aceae to the *stem* of the name of the type genus. It has developed in correspondence that the "stem" of a word is a concept not in use in the teaching of Latin in France; instead, French latinists speak of the "radical", which is in effect the stem without any terminal vowel which it might have. The effect of Pichon's and of Rickett's proposals is therefore the same in their respective languages; and it is recommended that, if the principle is accepted by the Section, as it is by the Committee, the Editorial Committee be instructed to adopt the appropriate wording for each version, though one is not an exact translation of the other.

A subsidiary point is whether the genitive should be cited as a guide to the "stem" or the "radical". It seems to be a safe guide for the latter, though it will not always show the stem. Rickett proposes to add to his original proposal: "(For the treatment of final vowels of stems in composition, see Rec. 82H". The long explanatory note and examples of Prop. D seem both unnecessary and inadequate.

The proposed Note 2 of Prop. D (47) is emphatically opposed by the Committee. This would apparently reduce such names as Fabaceae, Sapotaceae, Cactaceae to synonymy.

This, however, is not a matter of orthography; certainly the proposed Note 3, and Prop. E are not, and are not here considered.

APPENDICE II

LISTE ELECTORALE-INSTITUTS — ELECTORAL ROLL-INSTITUTES *

	votes
Aberdeen (Great Britain)	
Dept. of Botany, the University	1
Aberystwyth (Great Britain)	
The Painter Herbarium	1
Achimota (Gold Coast)	
The Gold Coast Herbarium	1
Adelaide (S. Australia)	
Botany School, University of Adelaide	1
Alger (Alger)	
Laboratoire de Botanique de la Fac. des Sciences	3
Ames (U.S.A.)	
Iowa State College (Bot. Dept.)	1
Amherst (U.S.A.)	
Dept. of Botany, University of Massachusetts	1
Amsterdam (Netherlands)	
Hugo de Vries Laboratories	1
Ankara (Turkey)	
Ankara Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi Botanik Enstitüsü	1
Ann Arbor (U.S.A.)	
University Herbarium, University of Michigan	5
Antwerpen (Belgium)	
Natuurwetenschappelijk Museum	1
Athens (U.S.A.)	
Herbarium of the University of Georgia	1
Auckland (New Zealand)	votes
Auckland Institute and Museum	1
Avignon (France)	
Museum Requien d'Histoire Naturelle de la Ville d'Avignon	1
Bangkok (Thailand)	
Botanical Herbarium, Plant Division	1
Barcelona (Spain)	
Instituto Botánico de Barcelona	3
Basel (Switzerland)	
Botanisches Institut der Universität Basel	1
Belem (Brazil)	
Instituto Agronómico do Norte	1
Beltsville (U.S.A.)	
Division of Mycology and Disease Survey Plant Industry Station	3
Bergen (Norway)	
Universitetets Botaniske Museum	1
Berkeley (U.S.A.)	
Herbarium of the University of California	5
Berkeley (U.S.A.)	
Jepson Herbarium and Library	1
Berlin (Germany)	
Botanisches Museum	3
Bern (Switzerland)	
Herbarium des Botan. Instituts und Gartens der Universität Bern	1
Bern (Switzerland)	
Schweizerische Gartenbau-Kommission	1
Birmingham (Gr. Britain)	
Dept. of Botany, The University	1

* *Italics* indicate that the respective institute was actually represented at the Paris meeting.

Bloomington (U.S.A.)
Indiana University 1
Bogor (Indonesia)
Herbarium Bogoriense 5
Bogota (Colombia)
Herbario Nacional de Colombia, Instituto de Ciencias Naturales 1
Bombay (India)
Blatter Herbarium, St Xavier's College 1
Bordeaux (France)
Jardin Botanique de la ville de Bordeaux 1
Bratislava (Czechoslovakia)
Botanický ústav Slovenskej university 1
Brignoles (France)
Salgues Foundation of Brignoles for the development of Biological Sciences 1
Brisbane (Australia)
Dept. of Agriculture and Stock 3
Brno (Czechoslovakia)
Botanical Institute and Herbarium 1
Brooklyn (U.S.A.)
Brooklyn Botanic Garden 1
Bruxelles (Belgium)
Jardin Botanique de l'Etat 7
Bruxelles (Belgium)
Institut de Botanique de l'Université 1
Bucuresti (Roumania)
Institutul si Muzeul Botanic al Universitati Bucuresti 1
Budapest (Hungary)
Museum of Natural History, Dept. of Botany 5
Buenos Aires (Argentina)
Instituto de Botánica del M.A.G.N. 1
Buenos Aires (Argentina)
Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales Bernardino Rivadavia 1
Caen (France)
Institut botanique de la Faculté des Sciences 3
Cairo (Egypt)
Herbarium Agricultural Museum 1
Cairo
Dept. of Botany, Faculty of Science, Cairo University 3
Calcutta (India)
Indian Botanic Garden 3
Cambridge (Great Britain)
Botany School, University of Cambridge 1
Cambridge (U.S.A.)
Gray Herbarium of Harvard University 5
Cambridge (U.S.A.)
Farlow Library and Herbarium of Cryptogamic Botany, Harvard University 1
Cambridge (U.S.A.)
Economic and Orchid Herbarium of Oakes Ames 1
Cape Town (S. Africa)
National Botanic Gardens 1
Cape Town (S. Africa)
Bolus Herbarium, University of Cape Town 1
Cape Town (S. Africa)
South African Museum Herbarium 1
Caracas (Venezuela)
Instituto Botánico 1
Cardiff (Great Britain)
Department of Botany, National Museum of Wales 1
Chapultepec (Mexico)
Instituto de Biología 1
Charkow (U.S.S.R.)
Herbarium of the Ukranian Institute for Scientific Research of Socialist Agriculture 3
Chengtu (China)
The Herbarium of the Dept. of Biology, National Szechuan University 1
Chicago (U.S.A.)
Chicago Natural History Museum 5
Cincinnati (U.S.A.)
Botany Dept., University of Cincinnati 1
Claremont (U.S.A.)
Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden 1
Claremont (U.S.A.)
Herbarium of Pomona College 1
Clermont-Ferrand (France)
Institut Botanique de la Faculté des Sciences 1
Cluj (Roumania)
Institutul Botanica Sistematica, Muzeul si Grâd. Botanica, Universitate 1
Coimbatore (S. India)
Madras Herbarium, Agricultural College and Research Institute 1
Coimbra (Portugal)
Botanical Institute of the University 1
Copenhagen (Denmark)
Botanical Museum and Herbarium 3
Copenhagen (Denmark)
Department of Plant Pathology 1
Cordoba (Argentina)
Museo Botánico, Facultad de Ciencias E.F. y Naturales 1
Corvallis (U.S.A.)
Oregon State College 1
Dallas (U.S.A.)
Herbarium of Southern Methodist University 1
Dakar (Africa)
Institut Français d'Afrique Noire 1
Debrecen (Hungary)
Institute of Botany, University of Debrecen 1

Dehra Dun (India)
Forest Research Institute 1
Dublin (Ireland)
School of Botany, Trinity College 1
Durban (S. Africa)
Natal Herbarium 1
Durham (U.S.A.)
Duke University 1
East Lansing (U.S.A.)
Michigan State College 1
Edinburgh (Great Britain)
Royal Botanic Garden 5
Firenze (Italy)
Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico 5
Fukuoka (Japan)
Herbarium of Botanical Institute, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University 1
Gainesville (U.S.A.)
Herbarium, Agricultural Experiment Station 1
Gatersleben (Germany)
Institut für Kulturpflanzenforschung 1
Genève (Switzerland)
Conservatoire et Jardin botaniques 5
Glasgow (Great Britain)
Department of Botany, University of Glasgow 1
Göteborg (Sweden)
Göteborgs Botaniska Trädgård 1
Göttingen (Germany)
Systematisch-Geobotanisch Institut 1
Graz (Austria)
Institut für systematische Botanik 1
Greencastle (U.S.A.)
DePauw University 1
Grenoble (France)
Institut de Botanique de la Faculté des Sciences 1
Groningen (Netherlands)
Botanical Herbarium 1
Habana (Cuba)
Herbario de la Salle, Colegio de La Salle 3
Hábana (Cuba)
Jardín Botánico de la Universidad de Habana 3
Hamburg (Germany)
Staatsinstitut für allgemeine Botanik 1
Helsinki (Finland)
Botanical Museum 5
Honolulu (U.S.A.)
Bernice P. Bishop Museum 3
Iasi (Roumania)
Laboratorul si Muzeul Botanic, Facultatea de Stiinte Naturale, Universitatea din Iasi 1
Ibadan (Nigeria)
Forest Department 1
Innsbruck (Austria)
Botanisches Institut der Universität 1
Iowa City (U.S.A.)
State University of Iowa 1
Ithaca (U.S.A.)
Bailey Hortorium 1
Ithaca (U.S.A.)
Department of Plant Pathology, Cornell University 1
Ithaca (U.S.A.)
Wiegand Herbarium of Cornell University 1
Jamaica Plain (U.S.A.)
Arnold Arboretum 5
Jena (Germany)
Institut für Spezielle Botanik und Herbarium Haussknecht 1
Jeruzalem (Israel)
Department of Botany, Hebrew University 1
Johannesburg (S. Africa)
The Moss Herbarium, University of the Witwatersrand 1
Kepong (Malaya)
Forest Research Institute 1
Kew (Great Britain)
The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens 7
Kew (Great Britain)
Commonwealth Mycological Institute 3
Knoxville (U.S.A.)
The Herbarium, The University of Tennessee 1
Krakow (Poland)
Herbarium Horti Botanici Universitatis Jagellonicae 1
La Plata (Argentina)
Museo de La Plata, División Botánica 3
La Plata (Argentina)
Instituto de Botánica C. Spegazzini 1
Laramie (U.S.A.)
Rocky Mountain Herbarium, University of Wyoming 1
Lausanne (Switzerland)
Musée botanique cantonal 1
Leiden (Netherlands)
Rijksherbarium 7
Leningrad (U.S.S.R.)
Komarov Botanical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R. 5
Leningrad (U.S.S.R.)
Herbarium of Cultivated Plants, Institute of Plant Industry 1
Liège (Belgium)
Institut et Jardin Botanique de l'Université de Liège 3
Lima (Peru)
Herbario San Marcos, Museo de Historia Natural 1

Linz (Austria)
Biologische Abteilung am O.Ö. Landesmuseum 1
Lisboa (Portugal)
Museu, Laboratórico e Jardim Botánico 3
Lisboa (Portugal)
Instituto Superior de Agronômia 1
Lisboa-Belem (Portugal)
Jardim Colonial e Museu Agricola Colonial 1
London (Great Britain)
British Museum (Natural History) 7
London (Great Britain)
South London Botanical Institute 1
Los Angeles (U.S.A.)
Herbarium of the Allan Hancock Foundation, University of Southern California 1
Los Angeles (U.S.A.)
Herbarium, Division of Botany, University of California 1
Louvain (Belgium)
Carnoy Institute 1
Lund (Sweden)
Botanical Museum and Herbarium 3
Madison (U.S.A.)
Herbarium of the University of Wisconsin 3
Madrid (Spain)
Instituto "Antonio José Cavanilles" 5
Madrid (Spain)
Herbario del Laboratorio de Botánica de la Facultad de Farmacia 1
Manchester (Great Britain)
The Manchester Museum, The University 1
Manila (Philippines)
Philippine National Herbarium, National Museum 1
Marseille (France)
Laboratoire de Botanique et Musée Colonial de la Faculté des Sciences 1
Melbourne (Australia)
National Herbarium of Victoria 5
Mexico (Mexico)
Herbario Nacional del Instituto de Biologia, Universidad Nacional de México 1
Minneapolis (U.S.A.)
Department of Botany, University of Minnesota 3
Montevideo (Uruguay)
Museo de Historia Natural 1
Montpellier (France)
Institut Botanique, Université de Montpellier 3
Montreal (Canada)
Herbier Marie-Victorin, Institut Botanique, Université de Montréal 3
Montreal (Canada)
Jardin Botanique de Montréal 3
Moscow (U.S.S.R.)
Herbarium of the University 3
München (Germany)
Botanische Staatssamlung 5
Nairobi (Kenya)
The East African Agriculture and Forestry Research Organisation, The East African Herbarium 1
Nanking (China)
The Herbarium 3
New Delhi (India)
Division of Botany, Indian Agricultural Research Institute 1
New Haven (U.S.A.)
Herbarium of Yale University, Osborne Botanical Laboratory 1
New York (U.S.A.)
The New York Botanical Garden 7
Oslo (Norway)
Botanisk Museum 3
Ottawa (Canada)
National Museum of Canada 5
Ottawa (Canada)
Division of Botany and Plant Pathology, Science Service 3
Oxford (Great Britain)
Fielding Herbarium, Druce Herbarium 1
Oxford (Great Britain)
Forest Herbarium, Dept. of Botany, University of Oxford 1
Padova (Italy)
Istituto Botanico 1
Paris (France)
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Lab. de Cryptogamie 7
Paris (France)
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Lab. de Phanérogamie 7
Pavia (Italy)
Botanical Institute and Italian Cryptogamic Laboratory 3
Peiping (China)
Institute of Botany, National Academy of Peiping 1
Peiping (China)
Fan Memorial Institute 1
Philadelphia (U.S.A.)
Academy of Natural Sciences 5
Philadelphia (U.S.A.)
Herbarium of Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science 1
Pittsburgh (U.S.A.)
Carnegie Museum Herbarium 1
Porto (Portugal)
Instituto de Botânica "Dr Gonçalo Sampaio" Universidade de Porto 1

Praha (Czechoslovakia)
Botanical Institute of the Charles University 3
Praha (Czechoslovakia)
Botanical Department of National Museum 3
Pretoria (S. Africa)
Division of Botany, National Herbarium 5
Pullman (U.S.A.)
State College of Washington 1
Quezon City (Philippines)
Herbarium of the Department of Botany, University of the Philippines 1
Rabat (Marocco)
Institut Scientifique Chérifien 3
Renner (U.S.A.)
Lundell Herbarium, Texas Research Foundation 1
Rio de Janeiro (Brazil)
Jardim Botanico 1
Rio de Janeiro (Brazil)
Divisao de Botanica do Museu Nacional 1
Sacavem (Portugal)
Estaçao Agronómica Nacional 1
Salisbury (S. Rhodesia)
Southern Rhodesia Government Herbarium 1
San Francisco (U.S.A.)
California Academy of Sciences 3
San Isidro (Argentina)
Instituto de Botánica Darwinion 1
Santiago (Chile)
Museo Nacional de Historia Natural 1
Sao Paulo (Brazil)
Instituto de Botânica 1
Sapporo (Japan)
The Botanical Institute, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University 3
Seattle (U.S.A.)
University of Washington, Herbarium 1
Shanghai (China)
Herbarium of the Institute of Botany, Academia Sinica 1
Singapore (Malaya)
Herbarium of the Botanic Gardens 3
Sofia (Bulgaria)
Botanical Institute of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences 1
Stanford (U.S.A.)
Dudley Herbarium, Natural History Museum, Stanford University 3
Stellenbosch (S. Africa)
Departement van Plantkunde, Universiteit van Stellenbosch 1
St Louis (U.S.A.)
Missouri Botanical Garden 3
Stockholm (Sweden)
Botanical Department, Naturhistoriska Riksmuseum 5
Stockholm (Sweden)
Palaeobotanical Department, Swedish Museum of Natural History 1
Stockholm (Sweden)
Hortus Botanicus Bergianus 1
Sydney (Australia)
National Herbarium of New South Wales 3
Taipei (China)
The Herbarium, National Taiwan University 1
Tananarive (Madagascar)
Institut de Recherche Scientifique de Madagascar 1
Tegucigalpa (Honduras)
Escuela Agricola Panamericana 1
Teheran (Iran)
Muzeyeh oloomeh Tabi-i (Natural History Museum) 1
Tokyo (Japan)
The National Science Museum 5
Tokyo (Japan)
Botanical Institute 3
Tokyo (Japan)
Japan Society of Plant Taxonomists 1
Tomsk (U.S.S.R.)
P. N. Krylow Herbarium of the State University W. W. Koeibysjew 1
Toronto (Canada)
Botany Department, University 1
Toulouse (France)
Laboratoire de Botanique, Faculté des Sciences 3
Tucson (U.S.A.)
University of Arizona 1
Tucuman (Argentina)
Instituto Miguel Lillo 5
Uppsala (Sweden)
Botaniska Museet, Uppsala Universitet 3
Uppsala (Sweden)
Växtbiologiska Institutionen, Uppsala Universitet 1
Urbana (U.S.A.)
Department of Botany, University of Illinois 1
Utrecht (Netherlands)
Botanical Museum and Herbarium 5
Wageningen (Netherlands)
Laboratory for Plant Taxonomy and Plant Geography 1
Washington (U.S.A.)
United States National Arboretum 3
Washington (U.S.A.)
Forest Service Herbarium, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture 1

Washington (U.S.A.)
U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution 7
Wellington (New Zealand)
The Dominion Museum 1
Wien (Austria)
Naturhistorisches Museum 5
Wien (Austria)
Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Institut der Universität 1
Wuchang (China)
Herbarium of Wu-Han University, Dept. of Biology 1
Zagreb (Yugoslavia)
Botanical Institute and Garden, Faculty of Sciences, University 3
Zürich (Switzerland)
Botanischer Garten und Museum der Universität 1

APPENDICE III

LISTE DES MEMBRES DE LA SECTION-LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SECTION

Ainsworth (Great Britain); Amaral Franco (Spain); Baehni (Switzerland); Balfour-Smith (.....); Boom (Netherlands); Boughey (Gold Coast); Bourrelly (France); Bremekamp (Netherlands); Burbidge (Australia); Camus (France); Correll (U.S.A.); Cuatrecasas (U.S.A.); Dandy (Great Britain); Demaret (Belgium); Desi Kachary (U.S.A.); Donk (Indonesia); Dumaz (France); Featherly (U.S.A.); Feldmann (France); Fernandes (Portugal); Fletcher (Great Britain); Florin (Sweden); Fosberg (U.S.A.); Frankton (Canada); Fulford (U.S.A.); Gams (Austria); Gardner Shaw (U.S.A.); Gilmour (Great Britain); Groves (Canada); Grumann (Germany); Hara (Japan); Harvis (New Zealand); Hawkes (Great Britain); Heckard (U.S.A.); Heywood (Spain); Hughes (Canada); Hutchins (U.S.A.); Hyde (Great Britain); Just (U.S.A.); Keck (U.S.A.); Korf (U.S.A.); Kremp (Germany); Lange (Denmark); Lanjouw (Netherlands); Le Gal (France); Léonard (Belgium); Levring (Sweden); McVaugh (U.S.A.); Mamay (U.S.A.); Martin (U.S.A.); Mason (Gr. Britain); Mrs Mason (Gr. Britain); Mason (U.S.A.); Mennega (Netherlands); Moreau (France); Morton (U.S.A.); Papenfuss (U.S.A.); Pichi Sermolli (Italy); Pichon (France); Pinto da Silva (Portugal); Ponce de Leon (Cuba); Potonié (Germany); Proskauer (U.S.A.); Rickett (U.S.A.); Robyns (Belgium); Rollins (U.S.A.); Ross (Great Britain); Rothmaler (Germany); Rousseau (Canada); Santesson (Sweden); Sayre (U.S.A.); Schulze (Germany); Silva (U.S.A.); Snyder (U.S.A.); Stafleu (Netherlands); van Steenis (Netherlands); Stevenson (U.S.A.); St John (U.S.A.); Stoffers (Netherlands); Tardieu Blot (France); Tomaselli (Italy); Taylor (Great Britain); Taylor (U.S.A.); Troupin (Belgium); Tryon (U.S.A.); Vermeulen (Netherlands); Welsh (Ireland); Wheeler (U.S.A.); de Wit (Netherlands); v. d. Wijk (Netherlands); Zander (Germany).

TAXON UND TAXONOMIE - ODER TAXION UND TAXIONOMIE?

von

J. Pacltl (Bratislava)

In letzter Zeit haben sich einige Autoren bemüht, die sprachliche Unrichtigkeit der Termini "Taxonomie" und "Taxon" zu beweisen (Richter 1954, Wolff 1954). Sie haben dabei vorgeschlagen, die Ausdrücke "Taxonomie" und "Taxon" in "Taxionomie" und "Taxion" zu berichtigen.

Der Terminus "Taxonomie" ist so alt, dass man heute überhaupt nicht weiss, wer der Erfinder des Wortes ist. Richter *(apud* Wolff 1954) glaubt, dass Leunis 1860 als Autor dieses Terminus gelten mag. Ich habe alsbald die Angabe der Priorität einer Überprüfung unterworfen und bin zu abweichenden Ergebnissen gekommen. Der Ausdruck erscheint nach meiner Feststellung nicht später als 1832 bei Duby (vgl. Literaturverzeichnis) und es ist durchaus wahrscheinlich, dass er bereits viele Jahre bevor in die Literatur eingeführt worden ist. Leunis (vgl. Wolff 1954) scheint dagegen der erste und zugleich wohl der letzte Autor zu sein, der die "reformierte" Schreibweise "Taxionomie" bevor 1954 benutzt hat. Die Leunis-sche Schreibweise lässt allerdings kein Zweifel darüber übrig, dass dieser (!) Naturforscher die Ableitung des Wortes von taxi|s und nomos vermutet hat.

Nun ist es jedoch kaum auszuschliessen, dass die ursprünglichere und allgemein benutzte Schreibweise "Taxonomie" sich eventuell von taxo (Fut. act. zu tatto "ich ordne") und nomos abgeleitet hat. Die Praktik, Wörter auf -nomie oder -logie mit einer Verb-Form zu verbinden, ist zwar wenig gebräuchlich*), nicht aber unrichtig. Die sprachliche Zulässigkeit (und nicht etwa die Intentio derivationis) muss hier — zusammen mit dem laufenden Usus — als Hauptkriterium gewertet werden. Dort, wo sich dagegen eine Schreibweise auf gar keine Weise erklären lässt als durch Unkenntnis der griechischen Sprache, müssen Änderungen eintreten; ich verweise hier nur auf die unmöglichen Schreibweisen "Basinym" und "Basonym", die berichtigt werden mussten (Paclt 1952), da die entsprechende Derivatio termini grammatisch nur (!) die Form "Basionym" (basi|s + onymos) zulässt.

Etwas abweichend liegen nun die Verhältnisse bei dem Terminus "Taxon", der zum erstenmal 1950 Eingang in die biologische Literatur genommen hat. Der Ausdruck wurde von Lam vorgeschlagen (vgl. Lanjouw 1950 : 12). Da wir das griechische Verbum tatto (tasso) theoretisch für die einzig mögliche Quelle von "Taxon" halten können, müsste — sprachlich streng genommen — das entsprechende Substantivum tetagmenon oder takton (nicht etwa "taxon") heissen. Ein Urteil ist mir neuerdings auch von dem bekannten Alt-Philologen der Frankfurter Universität bestätigt worden (Wolff 1955), nämlich der, dass "taxon" eine richtige Verbalform ist, deren Bedeutung aber dem zu benennenden Begriff nicht entspricht. In der Tat heisst taxon das Neutrum des aktiven Participiums futuri von tatto und bedeutet also "das was ordnen wird".

Praktisch käme jedoch noch ein anderes Wort als mögliche Quelle bei der Schaffung des Terminus "Taxon" in Betracht: Taxonomie. Ich möchte hier auf die trefflichen Worte von Wolff 1955 verweisen: "Wie in Astronomie "astron" (der Stern), in Archäologie "archaion" (das Alte, Vorzeitige), in Meteorologie "meteoron" (Himmelserscheinung der Atmosphäre) stecken, so zog man aus Taxonomie ein Wort Taxon heraus".

Jedenfalls muss der Ausdruck "Taxon" für einen willkürlich gebildeten Neologismus gehalten werden, was jedoch die weitere Benutzung desselben nicht hindert. Ein ebensolcher Neologismus ist nun die von Richter 1954 vorgeschlagene Schreibweise "Taxion".

Da sich die Form "Taxonomie" doch zwanglos (*cf. supra*) von taxo- und -nomie ableiten lässt, besteht wirklich kein Grund zur Änderung der bereits eingebürgerten Termini "Taxonomie" und "Taxon".

*) z.B. Phänologie (von faino "ich lasse erscheinen" und logos).

Schriften

Duby, J. E. 1832: Essai d'application à une tribue d'algues de quelques principes de taxonomie, ou Mémoire sur le groupe des Céramiées. Geneva.

Lanjouw, J. (ed.) 1950: Botanical Nomenclature and Taxonomy. Chron. bot. 12 (1-2): 1-88.

Paclt, J. 1952: Terminology of -onyms as applied in Taxonomy. Taxon 1: 110-111.

Richter, R. 1954: Taxion (nicht "Taxon") als Bezeichnung für die taxionomische Einheit. Senck. leth. 35: 268.

Richter, R. 1955: briefl. Mitt. v. 17. Juni.

Wolff, E. 1954: Taxionomie, Stratigraphie und Stratinomie (nicht Taxonomie, Stratographie und Stratonomie) und Verkürzungen wie Palichnologie, Palökologie. Senck. leth. 35: 115-117.

Wolff, E. 1955: briefl. Mitt. v. 17. Juni.

News and Notes

INDEX FILICUM COMMITTEE

At the VIIIth International Botanical Congress, Paris July 1954, the Taxonomy Section adopted a resolution calling the attention of the I.A.P.T. to the urgent importance of the publication of a continuation of C. Christensen's Index Filicum. It was suggested that other groups of Pteridophyta should also be included in the supplement. Since the Taxonomy Section requested the active cooperation of the I.A.P.T. to this end, the Executive Committee has invited the following botanists to act as members of an *Index Filicum Committee:*

A. H. G. Alston, London, Great Britain.
F. Ballard, Kew, Great Britain.
R. E. Holttum, Kew, Great Britain.
R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Florence, Italy.

Mme M. TARDIEU-BLOT, Paris, France.
R. M. TRYON Jr., St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A.
Dr Pichi-Sermolli has consented to act as secretary of the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON VIRUSES

The International Botanical Congress has authorized the constitution of a Committee for the Nomenclature of Plant Viruses to serve as a liaison between the Nomenclature Committee for Plant Viruses of the International Microbiological Congress and the Nomenclature section of the International Botanical Congress (see also Taxon 3: 191. 1954). The membership of this committee has now been established: it consists of the same persons as the Plant Viruses nomenclature committee of the Int. Microbiol. Congress with the addition of Dr G. Roland from Gembloux who will act as secretary:

F. C. BAWDEN, Harpenden, Great Britain.
C. W. BENNETT, Salina, Calif., U.S.A.
A. A. BITANCOURT, Sao Paulo, Brazil.
E. KÖHLER, Braunschweig, Germany.
P. LIMASSET, Montpellier, France.
I. W. PRENTICE, Harpenden, Great Britain.
T. H. THUNG, Wageningen, Netherlands.
E. VAN SLOCHTEREN, Lisse, Netherlands.
F. P. MCWHORTER, Corvallis, Ore., U.S.A.
G. ROLAND, Station de Phytopathologie, 8, Rue du Bordia, Gembloux, Belgium, *Secretary.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

The Editorial Committee, charged with the preparation of the new edition of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, will meet at Utrecht, Netherlands from Monday 14 until Friday 18 November 1955.

It is expected that this meeting will draw up a final draft of this 'Paris Code' and that its publication can be effected in the course of 1956. Botanists wanting to submit suggestions and corrections are requested to do this in writing to the secretary (Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands) before 14 November 1955.

ORCHID FLORA OF PERU

The treatise on the Orchidaceae for J. Francis Macbride's elaborate Flora of Peru (appearing from time to time as Special Publications of the Chicago Natural History Museum, formerly the Field Museum of Natural History) is in the final stages of the completed manuscript.

This work will include descriptions of every species found to be recorded from Peru, and will embrace about 900 concepts treated according to the latest standards of the author, Mr. CHARLES SCHWEINFURTH, who has devoted a life-time of study to this difficult and diverse family. It will appear in two volumes and will contain illustrations drawn by Messrs. GORDON W. DILLON, ELMER W. SMITH and Mrs. DOROTHY MARSH.

It will constitute the first orchid flora of the Andean region.

NOMEN CONSERVANDUM PROP.

(9) Proposal to conserve the original orthography of 891 **Vriesia** Lindley, Bot. Reg. 29: t. 10 (1843) versus *Vriesea* Lindley emend. Beer, Bromel. 91. 1857.

Type species: *V. psittacina* (Hooker) Lindley (*Tillandsia psittacina* Hooker).

Discussion: The original orthography *"Vriesia"* was clearly intentional because Lindley published it consistently in four different places in his description. It would appear that this was an intentional latinization of a personal name, as provided for in Article 82, note 4, of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1952). Unfortunately the orthography *"Vriesea"* was used in conserving the generic name against the earlier *Hexalepis* Rafinesque, but there was no indication of any correction so that the change here should be viewed as an oversight.

Proposed by: L. B. SMITH (Washington, D.C., U.S.A.).

A.E.T.F.A.T.-INDEX 1954

Considering the good reception the A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index 1953 had in all scientific botanical circles, it has been decided to continue the publication of this Index which apparently meets a real need.

This Index contains references to all that has been published during 1954 on the taxonomic botany in a wide sense of Africa and Madagascar.

The A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index mentions new taxa, including infraspecific divisions, the basionyms of new combinations with references to the place of publication and it also gives references to revisions and papers of taxonomic interest.

This booklet of 70 pages contains nearly 2.000 references for 1954 only.

Copies can be ordered as follows:

1. 100 Belgian francs to be transferred to postal check account 6242.67 of AETFAT-Index, Lab. Bot. Syst. U.L.B., 28, Av. P. Héger, Bruxelles, Belgique.

2. 700 French metropolitan francs to be transferred to postal check account Paris 11.528.60 of Mr. D. Normand, 6, Boulevard Gambetta, Nogent-sur-Marne, Seine, France.

3. 15 shillings to be transferred by either cheque or postal order crossed "a/c AETFAT" to Mr. A. A. Bullock, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

* * *

Vu le succès rencontré par l'A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index 1953 dans tous les milieux scientifiques botaniques, il a été décidé de poursuivre la publication de cet Index qui semble répondre à un réel besoin.

Conçu de la même façon que celui de 1953, cet Index contient les références de tout ce qui a paru durant l'année 1954 concernant la botanique systématique africaine et malgache prise au sens large.

L'A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index mentionne, en plus des taxa nouveaux, les divisions infraspécifiques, les basionymes des combinaisons nouvelles avec renvoi à la combinaison ainsi que de nombreuses références de revisions et de travaux intéressants au point de vue taxonomique.

Volume de près de 70 pages, cet Index contient environ 2.000 références rien que pour 1954!

On se le procure de l'une des façons suivantes:

1. 100 francs belges à virer au compte chèque postal 6242.67 de l'AETFAT-Index, Lab. Bot. Syst. U.L.B., 28, Av. P. Héger, Bruxelles, Belgique.

2. 700 francs français métropolitains à virer au compte chèque postal Paris 11.528.60 de M. D. Normand, 6, Boulevard Gambetta, Nogent-sur-Marne, Seine, France.

3. 15 shillings à virer par chèque ou mandat postal barré "a/c AETFAT" à M. A. A. Bullock, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

PERSONALIA

Dr D. Chatterjee, formerly Systematic Botanist, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, has been appointed Superintendent of the Indian Botanic Garden, Sibpur, Calcutta. He succeeds Dr K. Biswas who retired on August 1st, 1955.

Office

The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

Membership Fees

Members are requested to pay their membership fees to the regional treasurers.

Members in countries without regional treasurers are requested to make payable their subscriptions to *Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, Netherlands,* crossed: *"a.c. International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy".*

	$	£	D.fl.	Sw.Kr.
A. Individual Persons				
Regular Members	3.—	1.1.—	11.40	15.90
Associate Members	1.—	—.7.—	3.80	5.30
B. Institutes, Societies, etc.				
Supporting Members	50.—	17.10.—	190.—	265.—
Regular Members	25.—	8.15.—	95.—	132.50
Associate Members	10.—	3.10.—	38.—	53.—

Payments can be made in any currency; remittances in other currencies than those listed above are accepted against the exchange rates of the day of payment.

Council 1954-1959

President: R. C. Rollins, Cambridge, Mass.; *Vice-President:* W. Robyns, Bruxelles; *Secretary:* J. Lanjouw, Utrecht; *Administrator of finances:* J. Rousseau, Montréal; *Treasurer:* F. A. Stafleu, Utrecht; *Members:* Ch. Baehni, Genève; A. L. Cabrera, La Plata; C. M. Eardley, Adelaide; F. R. Fosberg, Washington; R. E. Fries, Stockholm; H. Humbert, Paris; H. Melchior, Berlin; J. A. Nannfeldt, Uppsala; C. G. G. J. van Steenis, Leiden; W. B. Turrill, Kew.

TAXON

Vol. I nos 1—9, 1951—1952; Vol. II nos 1—8, 1953; Vol. III nos 1—9, 1954.

Backnumbers (Vol. I nos. 3 & 4 excepted) are available for all members. Those who joined the I.A.P.T. on or after 1 Jan. 1954 can buy Vol. I (nos. 3 & 4 excepted) against $ 2.— and Vols. II & III (complete) against $ 3.— per copy. Single numbers are free for all regular members.

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.
All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.